

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COLUMBIA DIVISION

United States of America, ) CRIMINAL NO. 3:10-1160-CMC  
                                  )  
                                  )  
                                 v. ) **OPINION and ORDER**  
                                  )  
                                  )  
Shaquan Hines, )  
                                  )  
                                  )  
                                 Defendant. )  
                                  )  
                                  )  
                                  )\_\_\_\_\_

Defendant seeks relief in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255. Defendant raises two claims relating to alleged ineffective assistance of counsel. The Government filed a motion for summary judgment. Defendant has not responded to the the Government's motion and the time for doing so has expired.

The court has reviewed the complete record in this case, including Defendant's plea agreement, the transcript of the Rule 11 hearing in this matter, and the sentencing hearing transcript. For the reasons stated in the Government's response, which this court finds to be correct and adopts as its findings, the Government is entitled to summary judgment.

The Government's Motion for Summary Judgment is **granted** and the motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 is *dismissed with prejudice*.

**CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY**

The governing law provides that:

(c)(2) A certificate of appealability may issue . . . only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.

(c)(3) The certificate of appealability . . . shall indicate which specific issue or issues satisfy the showing required by paragraph (2).

28 U.S.C. § 2253(c). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists

would find this court's assessment of his constitutional claims is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling by the district court is likewise debatable. *See Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003); *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); *Rose v. Lee*, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001). In this case, the legal standard for the issuance of a certificate of appealability has not been met. Therefore, a certificate of appealability is **denied**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie

CAMERON McGOWAN CURRIE

SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina  
October 22, 2013